

In a later instance, the stubbornness of the House of Lords was overcome when George V privately let it be known that he would create sufficient peers to offset the opposition and follow the views of the House of Commons. Since that time the role of the House of Lords has been largely a ceremonial one. In effect the British Parliament consists of one House.

Perhaps we should consider the desirability of a unicameral national legislature. The Swedes have just changed their Parliament to a single chamber body and therefore such a move is not without modern precedent. Nebraska has a unicameral legislature. In addition, the equal representation requirement now imposed by the Supreme Court upon legislative bodies raises questions as to the constitutional position of the Senate as measured by this formula and in the case of Baker against Carr, Chief Justice Warren clearly found great logical difficulty in excluding the Senate from the operation of "one-man, one-vote" doctrine.

This proposal is a radical one and involves substantial constitutional change but no greater than those which took place between the property-holding days of the Constitution and the equality of franchise of today. Legislative demands are heavier today than ever, the volume of legislation is greater and its complexity increases with the broadening of the fields which are required to be covered. Efficiency of operation demands that unnecessary checks be eliminated. I certainly would not suggest the removal of necessary protective devices but I can see no liberty which would be effected by confining the enactment of our laws to a single body representative by regular redistricting of the population of the country in the manner of the present House.

Other suggestions have been made including the introduction of the rule of germaneness into the Senate legislation and the reduction of the margin required there to cut off a filibuster. In the House a simple majority suffices. It must be asked however whether these revisions would do the necessary job. I would tend to accept the conservative solution if that promised to be effective but I suggest that the broader change is one that should seriously be considered in the light of the impasse which has been created in the closing days of this 91st Congress.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND TO THE CIA RETIREMENT FUND

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress recently passed S. 4571, a bill amending the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964.

The purpose of the bill was essentially to provide Central Intelligence Retirement with the same benefits recently provided civil service retirees.

However, included in the legislation was a provision which authorized the Civil Service Commission to transfer to the CIA retirement fund all Government contributions previously accumulated in the civil service retirement fund when employees of the civil service transferred into the Agency's retirement system.

The purpose of this authorization was to insure the actuarial soundness of the CIA retirement fund. Testimony developed by the committee indicated that execution of this authority would result in the transfer of approximately \$33 million from the civil service retirement fund to the CIA retirement fund. This sum would have represented past Government contributions for all Agency employees transferred to the CIA retirement system since 1964.

I am now advised that some staff people on the Civil Service Commission have questioned legislative intent in this regard. I am, therefore, making this statement to erase any doubt in the minds of any responsible authority as to the legislative intent of the Congress in this regard.

I trust that this will take care of the problem.

OPERATION NOEL

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago many of us had the opportunity to attend a Christmas party in the Longworth Cafeteria sponsored by Operation Noel. The purpose of the party was to say "Merry Christmas" and "Many Thanks" to our servicemen hospitalized in Washington area military hospitals.

Those of us who were there know what an outstanding success the party was, but few of us are aware of the hours of work that made it such a success, nor do we know of the many companies and individuals who contributed toward its success.

It takes the cooperation of many to put on a party such as this—to give our servicemen the tribute they so rightfully deserve. Without the help of concerns such as Anheuser-Busch and the American Medical Association, along with many other individuals too numerous to name, Operation Noel would have had a more difficult time.

The idea for Operation Noel was conceived last year by Joe Westner of Western Gear Corp. With the help of his wife, Fran, legislative assistant to Representative Tom KLEPPE of North Dakota, Kathy Pierpan, secretary to Representative ORIS PIKE of New York, and Jayne Gillenwaters and Pat Rinaldi, secretaries to Representative JOHN SCHMITZ of California, Joe Westner's Operation Noel put on a party the servicemen will never forget.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in saying "Thanks" to the many people who are well on their way to establishing a tradition—the Operation Noel Christmas party. As their organization progresses

from year to year, their search for contributions and assistance will become easier and easier. They have already received tremendous support from many who recognize the importance of showing our hospitalized servicemen that they are not forgotten at Christmas.

Congratulations, Operation Noel, for a job well done, and best wishes for the future.

PROGRAM AID TO CORN GROWERS

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a meeting this week with high officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I requested that in corn production areas of the Nation hit hard by the southern corn leaf blight, farmers be permitted to have soybeans considered as feed grains for purposes of maintaining their historical feed grain base.

I presented this request personally to Clarence D. Palmby, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and Carroll G. Brunt-haver, Associate Administrator of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

I also summarized my proposal in this letter:

Hon. CLARENCE PALMBY,
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Official forecasts during the corn blight information conference recently at the Beltsville, Maryland, experiment station give validity to the concern being expressed by farmers throughout the corn belt and particularly in the West Central Illinois District I represent.

As you know many producers were hard hit by the blight this past year and now face the uncertainties of the 1971 season. The Department has already shown concern for their problem by designating 58 counties disaster areas, including 10 counties in the District I represent, making such farmers eligible for emergency low-interest loans from the Farmers Home Administration. This concern is much appreciated.

These farmers now face an additional peril in the approaching season due to the short supply of blight-resistant seed.

My purpose in writing is to urge that you permit corn producers in blight-disaster counties to count acres planted to soybeans in 1971 as corn for purposes of history under the feed grains program. This would be especially helpful to small farmers for reasons I set forth below. As you know, the Agricultural Act of 1970 gives you this authority. I make this request only for 1971 because it appears the seed problem will largely be corrected by 1972.

I make the request with full awareness that the privilege of indiscriminate substitution can bring pressure on soybean supplies and therefore prices. I hold to the view that substitution should be approved only sparingly, under circumstances of genuine hardship, and only when it will not threaten soybean prices.

The recommendation I have made, in my view, meets these conditions.

Substitution would be permitted only in counties where the Department of Agriculture has already certified the existence of emergency conditions caused by widespread blight infestation and other production problems. Soybean production in 1971 is exceptionally good for 1971 so much so some observers see the possibility of substantial shortage of supplies.